

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	PPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/668,494	09/22/2000		Robert E. Jones	1981	
41131	7590	09/30/2004		EXAMINER	
KENNETH			DIXON, THOMAS A		
2010 WEST SEVENTH STREET COFFEYVILLE, KS 67337				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,			. 3629	
				DATE MAILED: 00/30/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/668,494	JONES, ROBERT E.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Thomas A. Dixon	3629					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 No	ovember 2003.						
	action is non-final.						
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 25-44 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-24 is/are withdrawn 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 25-39 and 41-44 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 40 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	from consideration.						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2000 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objec drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). sected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 09/668,494

Art Unit: 3629

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 have been cancelled. Applicant's arguments are moot in view of the cancellation of the claims. The rejections of the previous action are withdrawn.

2. Applicant's declaration that the invention is an improvement of the flight firming "Predator" product in response to the 37 CFR 1.105 requirement has been made of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 25-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 25, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention.

See MPEP § 2173.05(d). Further, "said operations" of lines 10 and 11 lack antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Application/Control Number: 09/668,494

Art Unit: 3629

4. Claims 25-37, 39, 41- 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being clearly anticipated by Henderson "Turning bookings into passengers" regarding "Predator".

As per Claim 25, 33.

Henderson discloses:

access to the database to acquire data for operations therewith, see page 1 lines 6-9 and 32-37;

returning the data to the database, to a predetermined location within the database to update the database, see page 1, line 24.

As per Claim 26, 37.

Henderson further discloses a queue, see line 24.

As per Claim 27, 36.

Henderson further discloses the system aimed at high load factor operations, see page 2, line 7.

As per Claim 28.

Henderson further discloses confirming of a reservation comprises the step of issuing a ticket, see page 1, lines 19-23.

As per Claim 29.

Henderson further discloses a robot and issuing a warning, see abstract and page 1, lines 19-21.

As per Claim 30, 34, 44.

Henderson further discloses checking for expired limiting standards and if the reservation is not confirmed, cancels the reservation, issues another warning or puts it in a queue, see abstract and page 1, lines 19-26.

As per Claim 31, 42.

Henderson further discloses the process remote from the database of reservations, see page 1, lines 34-37.

As per Claim 32.

Henderson further discloses the reservations are flight reservations and the process comprises flight firming, see page 1, lines 12-14.

As per Claim 35.

Henderson further discloses checking for ficticious names, see page 2, lines 24-26.

As per Claim 39.

Application/Control Number: 09/668,494

Art Unit: 3629

Henderson further discloses checking for existing ticket numbers, see page 1, lines 19-21.

As per Claim 41.

Henderson further discloses checking for reservations without a ticket number for existing ticketing time limit rules, see page 1, lines 19-24.

As per Claim 44.

Henderson further discloses checking for reservations previously subjected to firming and further flight firming to determine whether the reservations have been confirmed, see page 1, lines 21-24.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henderson, in view of PR Newswire "AAI Tools Idenify Ficticious Bookings in Realtime" regarding Predator, Troll and Dupe Snooper.

As per Claim 38.

Henderson discloses flight firming, but does not disclose checking a reservation for duplicate fight segments.

Dupe Snooper teaches checking a reservation for duplicate flight segments for the benefit of getting rid of duplicate bookings.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use the duplicate flight segment identification of Dupe Snooper with the Predator program for the benefit of getting rid of duplicate bookings.

Allowable Subject Matter

Art Unit: 3629

6. Claim 40 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As per claim 40. Henderson in view PR Newswire does not disclose: a system for firming flights checking a reservation for duplicate ticket numbers.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas A. Dixon whose telephone number is (703) 305-4645. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 6:30 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (703) 308-2702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Thomas A. Dixon

Examiner Art Unit 3629

September 04